Application No. Applicant(s) 10/709,138 MURAYAMA, KEI Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit 1792 Katherine A. Bareford All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Katherine A. Bareford. (4) . (2) William Brooks. Date of Interview: 21 January 2009. Type: a) ✓ Telephonic b) ✓ Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative e) No. Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: _____. Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: _____ Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed removal of features in last two lines of claim 1 to remove 35 USC 112 rejection. Also discussed providing that oxidizing agent selectively coated only in areas less than 30 microns. Discussed question of capability of providing patterning of material in this size and whether the references suggest selectively coating in this small an area, but no agreement was reached. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792